REMARKS

Examiner White is again thanked for his careful consideration of the present patent application. For the reasons that follow, however, the § 103 rejection is deemed improper, and should be withdrawn.

OK to enter this Amendment E.W. 2/13/2006

The Eastman reference, the principal reference cited by the Examiner, is not concerned with a crosslinked starch, and indeed the teachings of the Eastman reference are antithetical to the methods for preparing a crosslinked starch claimed in the present patent application. Eastman is concerned with providing starches that have viscosities within a given range. According to Eastman, after providing or preparing a hydryoxyalkyl starch, the starch subsequently is thinned to the desired viscosity level. The thinning is a depolymerization step. Accordingly, Eastman repeatedly teaches to avoid crosslinking the starch. As set forth at column 2, line 16, et seq., for instance, the multi-step process purportedly disclosed by Eastman includes, esterified starch derivative remaining in non-crosslinked, granular form." Elsewhere, at column 4, line 47, et seq., Eastman indicates that an etherified starch can be prepared via conventional procedures "so long as the resulting derivatized starch product remains in non-gelatinized, non-crosslinked granular form following the derivatization reactions."

At column 7, line 22, et seq., Eastman discusses the depolymerization procedure, and teaches that the depolymerization is necessary to achieve the desired viscosity of the final starch product.

Given Eastman's emphasis on a non-crosslinked starch, and particularly given Eastman's teaching that a depolymerization step should be applied to a starch, Eastman cannot be used to support a rejection of the pending claims, which specify crosslinking. The Tuschhoff reference (and numerous other references in the prior art) disclose crosslinking of starches, but these teachings cannot fairly be combined with those of the Eastman reference, which teach to avoid crosslinking of a derivatized starch and to depolymerize the derivatized starch thus formed. It is further noted that the Tuschhoff reference is specifically directed towards a pasting starch, and

thus this reference or its own merits neither anticipates nor renders obvious any of the presently pending claims.

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request that the § 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 31, 2006

Allen E. Hoover
Registration No. 37,354
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001

62. (New) A method according to claim 56, wherein said hydroxyalkylating agent is propylene oxide or ethylene oxide.

63. (New) A method according to claim 56, wherein said hydroxyalkylating agent is ethylene oxide.

REMARKS

Examiner White is thanked for his careful consideration of the application.

As defined in each of claims 48 and 56, the invention is directed towards a method for preparing a cold water soluble starch that is cold-water soluble, non-pasting, and crosslinked. Such starch is not disclosed by Eastman. Eastman repeatedly teaches narrow conditions should be used to avoid pasting of the starch, thus teaching that the starch prepared therein is a pasting starch (despite the teaching of a high DS). (Col 5, l. 7-8, 48-50, 65-68, Col 6, l. 8-11, 39-43). Eastman also teaches to avoid cross-linking; *see* col. 4. The section 103 rejection accordingly cannot be applied to the pending claims.

The art cited earlier against the present application is likewise not seen to teach or suggest the present invention. Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 18, 2005

Allen E. Hoover
Registration No. 37,354
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
10 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 3000
Chicago, IL 60606-7407
Telephone: 312-463-5000
Facsimile: 312-463-5001